

REMARKS

At the outset, Applicants thank the Examiner for examining the pending application. The Office Action, dated May 11, 2006, has been received and its contents reviewed.

Claims 1, 3, 5, 7, and 10 are hereby amended and claims 2, 9, and 14-19 are cancelled without prejudice. Accordingly, claims 1, 3-8, and 10-13 are pending in the present application.

The Applicants thank the Examiner for taking the time to speak with the Applicants' Representatives on June 15, 2006. The substance of the interview is set forth in the Remarks and constitutes a record of the interview. We discussed how claim 1 as presented, overcomes the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph rejection of record. Further, we discussed amending claims 2 and 9 into independent form and cancelling the withdrawn claims 14-19. The Examiner agreed these claims would then distinguish over the prior art of record.

The Office Action rejected claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for allegedly failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicants regard as the invention. More specifically, the Office Action questions how the display panel can be both curved and have a fused planar contact. The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As discussed in the interview with the Examiner, the Applicants submit that limitation "a display panel having a portion that follows a curved contour" does not limit the entire structure to a curved contour. Accordingly, the Applicants request that this rejection be withdrawn. The Office Action rejected claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,119,678 to *Marchand* (hereinafter "*Marchand*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,971,510 to *Lickiss et al.* (hereinafter "*Lickiss*"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

As required in Chapter 2143.03 of the M.P.E.P., in order to "establish *prima facie* obviousness of the claimed invention, all the limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art." The Applicants have amended claim 1 to include all the limitations of previously dependent

claim 2 and claim 2 has now been cancelled, rendering the rejection of this claim moot. Further, as discussed in the interview, the Applicants submit that neither *Marchand* nor *Lickiss* either singularly or in combination, teach or suggest each and every element recited in currently amended claim 1.

For at least the aforementioned reasons, the Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over *Marchand* in view of *Lickiss*, and request that the rejection be withdrawn. Likewise, claims 3-6, which depend from claim 1 are also patentable for at least the same reason.

The Office Action rejected claims 7-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lickiss* in view of *Marchand*. The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

The Applicants have amended claim 7 to include all the limitations of previously dependent claim 9 and claim 9 has now been cancelled, rendering the rejection of this claim moot. Further, as discussed in the interview, the Applicants submit that neither *Lickiss* nor *Marchand* either singularly or in combination, teach or suggest each and every element recited in currently amended claim 7.

For at least the aforementioned reasons, the Applicants respectfully submit that claim 7 is patentably distinguishable over *Lickiss* in view of *Marchand*, and request that the rejection be withdrawn. Likewise, claims 8, 10-13, which depend from claim 7 are also patentable for at least the same reason.

The application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited. If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

Application No.: 10/717,906
Amdt. dated October 11, 2006
Reply to Office Action dated May 11, 2006

Docket No.: 9988.082.00

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: October 11, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Mark R. Kresloff

Registration No.: 42,756

McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP

1900 K Street, N.W.

Washington, DC 20006

Attorneys for Applicant